drug production formulation production, export sales etc. The response from companies recording submission of Form-6 has been lukewarm.

**Cases referred to State Drug Authorities**

2629. SHRI NYODEK YONGGAM:
SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that his ministry have only referred cases of certain Indian companies to respective State Drug Authorities for investigation of their prices;

(b) if so, the total number of cases referred each year after the announcement of DPCO-1987;

(c) what is the total number of units which are operating in India which are under price control;

(d) what are the details of companies who have submitted their price lists to the Ministry;

(c) what are the names of the companies whose price lists have been examined and studied during the last three years, year-wise;

(f) whether it is a fact that his ministry have directed certain states Drug Authorities, to collect their price list and investigate their prices; and

(g) if so, the number of cases/directions sent per year after the announcement of DPCO-1987?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS & FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) and (f) Under the provisions of DPCO, 87 and the Essential Commodities Act, the powers have been vested with the State Governments and its officers for taking action in case of violation of DPCO. Under para 16 of DPCO, 87 every manufacturer, importer or distributor has to furnish price list to the Central Government, State Drug Controllers and the dealers. Attention of all the State Drug Controllers has been drawn to these provisions and they have been requested to scrutinize the price list to ensure that the companies market the products at the prices approved by the Government.

(b), (e) & (g) The time required to collect the information from the old records regarding all the cases referred to State Drug Authorities would not be commensurate with the results likely to be achieved. However, cases of some companies have recently been referred to the concerned State Drug Authorities.

(c) It is estimated that the total number of organised sector pharma units is around 250.

(d) Government have received price lists from 107 companies since April, 1992.

**Prices of Ampicillin Cloxacillin**

2630. SHRIMATI KAILASHPATI:
SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that prices of Ampicillin Cloxacillin, other semisynthetic Pencilline formulations and else formulations based on many other drugs were not announced even after the reduction was approved for over a year;

(b) whether it is also a fact that in certain cases the prices were never reduced despite the reduction in bulk drug prices;

(c) if so, what are the details of such instances after the announcement of Drug Prices Control Order, 1987;

(d) what are the reasons and who are responsible for this act of providing benefit to drug producers at the cost of poor consumer;

(e) whether it is fact that certain files concerning these issues have been missing from his Department; and

(f) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (c) As stated in reply to

the Unstarred Question NO. 673 on 28.11.1991, before the Government could notify the prices of ceiling packs, on the basis of reduced prices of bulk drugs, there was change in the exchange rate of rupee against major foreign currencies. As a result, prices of nine out of eleven bulk drugs were revised upwards. In four cases, the revised prices were more than the pre-revised prices. The prices of ceiling packs of formulations, based on other bulk drugs, were reduced wherever necessary, based on the prevailing packaging material ceilings and norms for conversion/packing charges.

(d) Does not arise.

(e) and (f) No, Sir.

**Decision in the case of M/s. Hoechst**

2631. SHRIMATI KAILASHPATI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 3084 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 6th August, 1992 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that even after getting date from the company and giving a final hearing to the company, no order has been passed in the case of Hoechst;

(b) whether it is a fact that the case is being passed from one department to the other;

(c) what are the departments being considered and on what issue; and

(d) when was the case referred to each department during the last three years and what is the present position of it?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) As per the time bound schedule framed by Bombay High Court finalising the liability, giving the hearing to the Company and passing a final speaking order, the process of giving data by the company and giving the details to M/s. Hoechst is almost over. The determination of liability is in progress and will be communicated to the company soon and thereafter as per Bombay High Court's direction the company will be given a hearing and a speaking order will be passed.

(b) No Sir.

(c) and (d) Does not arise.

**Calcutta High Court's decision in favour of M/s. Carews**

2632. SHRIMATI KAILASHPATI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 3084 given in the Rajya Sabha on 6th August, 1992 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that his Ministry have lost case against M/s. Carews in the Calcutta High Court for non-follow up of the matter;

(b) what is the judgement of the High Court and what action has been taken against the judgement;

(c) whether it is a fact that this company belongs to Mullaya Group;

(d) if so, what are the reasons for not taking any action for operating without permission under I (D and R) Act and also marketing other products without price approval; and

(e) what are the names of such products and since when each is being marketed?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) and (b) The Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in the judgement dated 26th June, 1992 has directed the Government to accord necessary exemption to the petitioner's product 'Combiflam' as per Notification No. S.O. 719 (E) dated 21.7.1988. Government filed stay petition/memorandum of appeal against the above judgement. Though a copy of the judgement has not been received so far, it is learnt that the Order dated 26.6.1992 has been stayed by the Division Bench of the Calcutta High Court.